REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in the present application.

A. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-5, 7-11, and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lapstun et al. (2004/0046971). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Lapstun et al. is respectfully traversed.

In formulating the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), the Examiner alleges that Lapstun et al. teaches providing a plurality of color space transformation profiles; assigns a first set of color processing options to a first group of pages in the job; assigning a second set of color processing options to a second group of pages in the job, the second set of color processing options identifying a color space transformation profile; receiving a page of image data to be rendered; determining if the page of image data to be rendered is associated with the first group of pages in the job or associated with the second group of pages in the job; selecting a color space transformation profile for the received page of image data when it has been determined that the page of image data to be rendered is associated with the first group of pages in the job; selecting the color space transformation profile in the second set of color processing options when it has been determined that the page of image data to be rendered is associated with the second group of pages in the job; and applying the selected color space transformation profile to render the page of image data. Based upon these allegations, the Examiner concludes that the presently claimed invention would be anticipated by the teachings of Lapstun et al. These positions and conclusion by the Examiner are respectfully traversed.

1. Independent Claim 1

The presently claimed invention, as set forth by independent claim 1, is directed to a method for applying individualized rendering parameters on a single page basis to enable rendering of image data associated with a job having a plurality of pages. The method provides a plurality of color space transformation profiles; assigns a first set of color processing options to a first group of pages in the job; assigns a second set of color processing options to a second group of pages in the job, the second set of color processing options identifying a color space transformation profile; receives a page of image data to be rendered; determines if the page of image data to be rendered is associated with the first group of pages in the job or associated with the second group of pages in the job; selects a color space transformation profile for the received page of image data when it has been determined that the page of image data to be rendered is associated with the first group of pages in the job; selects the color space transformation profile in the second set of color processing options when it has been determined that the page of image data to be rendered is associated with the second group of pages in the job; and applies the selected color space transformation profile to render the page of image data.

As noted above, the Examiner alleges that Lapstun et al. teaches, at paragraphs [0102] & [0103], the capability of rendering color processing options and/or colorspace transformation profiles on a page-by-page basis.

Paragraphs [0102] & [0103] of Lapstun et al. is void of any teaching or suggestion with respect to the capability of rendering color processing options and/or colorspace transformation profiles on a page-by-page basis. More specifically, paragraphs [0102] & [0103] of Lapstun et al. set forth:

> [0102] The act of interrupting a Memjet-based printer during the printing of a page produces a visible discontinuity, so it is advantageous for the printer to receive the entire page before commencing printing, to eliminate the possibility of buffer underrun. Furthermore, if the transmission of the page from the host to the printer takes significant time in relation to the time it takes to print the page, then it is advantageous to provide two page buffers in the printer so that one page can be printed

> while the next is being received. If the transmission time of a page is less than its 2-second printing time, then double-buffering allows the full 30 pages/minute page rate of CePrint to be achieved.
>
> [0103] **FIG. 6** illustrates the sustained printing rate achievable with double-buffering in the printer, assuming 2-second page rendering and 2-second page transmission.

As clearly set forth above, paragraphs [0102] & [0103] of Lapstun et al. teaches a buffering solution to increase printing speed. These paragraphs of Lapstun et al. fail to teach the capability of rendering color processing options and/or colorspace transformation profiles on a page-by-page basis.

In response to this argument, the Examiner assets that Lapstun et al. teaches , at paragraphs [0089] & [0110], the rendering of each page of a print job. Moreover, the Examiner assets that Lapstun et al. teaches, at paragraph [0620], color management support and color profiles of a device wherein the printer can activate different color profiles. Based on this allegation, the Examiner concludes that paragraph [0620] of Lapstun et al. provides support for concluding that the device taught by Lapstun et al. is capable of rendering color processing options and/or color space transformations profiles on a page-by-page basis.

Paragraph [0620] of Lapstun et al. is void of any teaching or suggestion with respect to the capability of rendering color processing options and/or colorspace transformation profiles on a page-by-page basis. More specifically, paragraph [0620] of Lapstun et al. sets forth:

> The application has random access to the entire device surface. This means that if a memory-limited printer device requires banded output, then GDI must buffer the entire page's GDI commands and replay them windowed into each band in turn. Although this provides the application with great flexibility, it can adversely affect performance. GDI supports color management, whereby device-independent colors provided by the application are transparently translated into device-dependent colors according to a standard ICC (International Color Consortium) color profile of the device. A printer driver can activate a different color profile depending, for example, on the user's selection of paper type on the driver-managed printer property sheet.

As clearly set forth above, paragraph [0620] of Lapstun et al. teaches that a different color profile can be activated depending upon a paper type selected by the user. In other words, Lapstun et al. fails to teach or suggest rendering color processing options and/or colorspace transformation profiles on a page-by-page basis. More specifically, selection based on a paper type does teach the skilled artisan that the selection could be made on a page-by-page basis.

Anticipation is based what is actually taught by the prior art. The use of speculation by the Examiner as to what a device might be capable of doing is an improper basis for finding anticipation.

Thus, Lapstun et al. fails to teach the capability of rendering color processing options and/or colorspace transformation profiles on a page-by-page basis, as set forth by independent claim 1.

2. Independent Claim 7

The presently claimed invention, as set forth by independent claim 7, is directed to a system for selecting a color space transformation profile to enable rendering image data associated with a job having a plurality of pages. The system includes a storage device to store and provide a plurality of color space transformation profiles; an input device providing job programming attributes for the job, the job programming attributes including a first set of color processing options to apply to a first group of pages in the job and a second set of color processing options to apply to a second group of pages in the job, the second set of color processing options identifying a color space transformation profile; a color profile manager, responsive to the job programming attributes provided by the input device, to select a color space transformation profile for the received page of image data when it has been determined that the page of image data to be rendered is associated with the first group of pages in the job or to retrieve the color space transformation profile in the second set of color processing options when it has been determined that the page of image data to be rendered is associated with the second group of pages in the job; and an imager to apply the selected color space transformation profile to the image data.

As noted above, the Examiner alleges that Lapstun et al. teaches, at paragraphs [0102] & [0103], the capability of rendering color processing options and/or colorspace transformation profiles on a page-by-page basis.

Paragraphs [0102] & [0103] of Lapstun et al. is void of any teaching or suggestion with respect to the capability of rendering color processing options and/or colorspace transformation profiles on a page-by-page basis. More specifically, paragraphs [0102] & [0103] of Lapstun et al. set forth:

> [0102] The act of interrupting a Memjet-based printer during the printing of a page produces a visible discontinuity, so it is advantageous for the printer to receive the entire page before commencing printing, to eliminate the possibility of buffer underrun. Furthermore, if the transmission of the page from the host to the printer takes significant time in relation to the time it takes to print the page, then it is advantageous to provide two page buffers in the printer so that one page can be printed while the next is being received. If the transmission time of a page is less than its 2-second printing time, then double-buffering allows the full 30 pages/minute page rate of CePrint to be achieved.
>
> [0103] **FIG. 6** illustrates the sustained printing rate achievable with double-buffering in the printer, assuming 2-second page rendering and 2-second page transmission.

As clearly set forth above, paragraphs [0102] & [0103] of Lapstun et al. teaches a buffering solution to increase printing speed. These paragraphs of Lapstun et al. fail to teach the capability of rendering color processing options and/or colorspace transformation profiles on a page-by-page basis.

In response to this argument, the Examiner assets that Lapstun et al. teaches , at paragraphs [0089] & [0110], the rendering of each page of a print job. Moreover, the Examiner assets that Lapstun et al. teaches, at paragraph [0620], color management support and color profiles of a device wherein the printer can activate different color profiles. Based on this allegation, the Examiner concludes that paragraph [0620] of Lapstun et al. provides support for concluding that the device taught by Lapstun et al. is capable of rendering color processing options and/or color space transformations profiles on a page-by-page basis.

Paragraph [0620] of Lapstun et al. is void of any teaching or suggestion with respect to the capability of rendering color processing options and/or colorspace transformation profiles on a page-by-page basis. More specifically, paragraph [0620] of Lapstun et al. sets forth:

> The application has random access to the entire device surface. This means that if a memory-limited printer device requires banded output, then GDI must buffer the entire page's GDI commands and replay them windowed into each band in turn. Although this provides the application with great flexibility, it can adversely affect performance. GDI supports color management, whereby device-independent colors provided by the application are transparently translated into device-dependent colors according to a standard ICC (International Color Consortium) color profile of the device. A printer driver can activate a different color profile depending, for example, on the user's selection of paper type on the driver-managed printer property sheet.

As clearly set forth above, paragraph [0620] of Lapstun et al. teaches that a different color profile can be activated depending upon a paper type selected by the user. In other words, Lapstun et al. fails to teach or suggest rendering color processing options and/or colorspace transformation profiles on a page-by-page basis. More specifically, selection based on a paper type does teach the skilled artisan that the selection could be made on a page-by-page basis.

Anticipation is based what is actually taught by the prior art. The use of speculation by the Examiner as to what a device might be capable of doing is an improper basis for finding anticipation.

Thus, Lapstun et al. fails to teach the capability of rendering color processing options and/or colorspace transformation profiles on a page-by-page basis, as set forth by independent claim 7.

3. Independent Claim 9

The presently claimed invention, as set forth by independent claim 9, is directed to a method for applying individualized rendering parameters on a single page basis to enable rendering of image data associated with a job having a plurality of pages. The method receives job programming attributes for the job, the job programming attributes including a first set of color processing options to apply to a first group of pages in the

job and a second set of color processing options to apply to a second group of pages in the job, the second set of color processing options identifying a color space transformation profile; receives a first page of image data to be rendered, the first page of image data being within the first group of pages; renders the first page of image data in accordance with the first set of color processing options; receives a second page of image data to be rendered, the second page of image data being within the second group of pages; retrieves the color space transformation profile identified in the second set of color processing options; and applies the retrieved color space transformation profile to render the second page of image data.

As noted above, the Examiner alleges that Lapstun et al. teaches, at paragraphs [0102] & [0103], the capability of rendering color processing options and/or colorspace transformation profiles on a page-by-page basis.

Paragraphs [0102] & [0103] of Lapstun et al. is void of any teaching or suggestion with respect to the capability of rendering color processing options and/or colorspace transformation profiles on a page-by-page basis. More specifically, paragraphs [0102] & [0103] of Lapstun et al. set forth:

> [0102] The act of interrupting a Memjet-based printer during the printing of a page produces a visible discontinuity, so it is advantageous for the printer to receive the entire page before commencing printing, to eliminate the possibility of buffer underrun. Furthermore, if the transmission of the page from the host to the printer takes significant time in relation to the time it takes to print the page, then it is advantageous to provide two page buffers in the printer so that one page can be printed while the next is being received. If the transmission time of a page is less than its 2-second printing time, then double-buffering allows the full 30 pages/minute page rate of CePrint to be achieved.
>
> [0103] **FIG. 6** illustrates the sustained printing rate achievable with double-buffering in the printer, assuming 2-second page rendering and 2-second page transmission.

As clearly set forth above, paragraphs [0102] & [0103] of Lapstun et al. teaches a buffering solution to increase printing speed. These paragraphs of Lapstun et al. fail to teach the capability of rendering color processing options and/or colorspace transformation profiles on a page-by-page basis.

In response to this argument, the Examiner assets that Lapstun et al. teaches , at paragraphs [0089] & [0110], the rendering of each page of a print job. Moreover, the Examiner assets that Lapstun et al. teaches, at paragraph [0620], color management support and color profiles of a device wherein the printer can activate different color profiles. Based on this allegation, the Examiner concludes that paragraph [0620] of Lapstun et al. provides support for concluding that the device taught by Lapstun et al. is capable of rendering color processing options and/or color space transformations profiles on a page-by-page basis.

Paragraph [0620] of Lapstun et al. is void of any teaching or suggestion with respect to the capability of rendering color processing options and/or colorspace transformation profiles on a page-by-page basis. More specifically, paragraph [0620] of Lapstun et al. sets forth:

> The application has random access to the entire device surface. This means that if a memory-limited printer device requires banded output, then GDI must buffer the entire page's GDI commands and replay them windowed into each band in turn. Although this provides the application with great flexibility, it can adversely affect performance. GDI supports color management, whereby device-independent colors provided by the application are transparently translated into device-dependent colors according to a standard ICC (International Color Consortium) color profile of the device. A printer driver can activate a different color profile depending, for example, on the user's selection of paper type on the driver-managed printer property sheet.

As clearly set forth above, paragraph [0620] of Lapstun et al. teaches that a different color profile can be activated depending upon a paper type selected by the user. In other words, Lapstun et al. fails to teach or suggest rendering color processing options and/or colorspace transformation profiles on a page-by-page basis. More specifically, selection based on a paper type does teach the skilled artisan that the selection could be made on a page-by-page basis.

Anticipation is based what is actually taught by the prior art. The use of speculation by the Examiner as to what a device might be capable of doing is an improper basis for finding anticipation.

Thus, Lapstun et al. fails to teach the capability of rendering color processing options and/or colorspace transformation profiles on a page-by-page basis, as set forth by independent claim 9.

4. Dependent Claims

With respect to dependent claims 2-5, 8, 10, 11, and 14, the Applicants, for the sake of brevity, will not address the reasons supporting patentability for each of these individual dependent claims, as these claims depend directly or indirectly from allowable independent claims 1, 7, and 9 for the reasons set forth above. The Applicants reserve the right to address the patentability of each of these dependent claims at a later time, should it be necessary.

Accordingly, in view of the amendments and remarks set forth above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

B. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 6 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Lapstun et al. (2004/0046971) in view of Balonon-Rosen et al. (US-A-6,307,961). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Lapstun et al. in view of Balonon-Rosen et al. is respectfully traversed.

With respect to dependent claims 6 and 15, the Applicants, for the sake of brevity, will not address the reasons supporting patentability for each of these individual dependent claims, as these claims depend directly or indirectly from allowable independent claims 1 and 9 for the reasons set forth above. The Applicants reserve the right to address the patentability of each of these dependent claims at a later time, should it be necessary.

Accordingly, in view of the remarks set forth above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

C. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 12, 13, 16, and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Lapstun et al. (2004/0046971) in view of Billow et al. (2005/0141008). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Lapstun et al. in view of Billow et al. is respectfully traversed.

With respect to dependent claims 12, 13, 16, and 17, the Applicants, for the sake of brevity, will not address the reasons supporting patentability for each of these individual dependent claims, as these claims depend directly or indirectly from allowable independent claim 9 for the reasons set forth above. The Applicants reserve the right to address the patentability of each of these dependent claims at a later time, should it be necessary.

Accordingly, in view of the remarks set forth above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of all the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the present rejections. Also, an early indication of allowability is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Nickerson
Registration No. 33,265
Basch & Nickerson LLP
1777 Penfield Road
Penfield, New York 14526
Telephone: (585) 899-3970

MJN/mjn